

## Remarks

### Rejections

The examiner refused registration on the basis of Kotaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,619,239.

But that reference does not teach or suggest the invention defined in the pending claims. To place Kotaki et al. in context, please note that the present invention's express intention is to provide a means of engaging a printer cartridge with a printhead that is *different from* Kotaki et al. See page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 2 of the application. And the present invention is meaningfully different from Kotaki et al.

The salient distinction between the pending claims and Kotaki et al. is that "the protrusion engages the printhead interior surface and no part of the protrusion, base, or lid engages the camming shoe."

Kotaki et al. does not satisfy that limitation. In Kotaki et al. the "protrusion" identified by the examiner (left side of 21) engages the camming shoe. See Fig. 10. A major purpose of the present invention is to engage the cartridge with the printhead *without* engaging the camming shoe. Thus, Kotaki et al. teaches the *opposite* of the invention.

It is telling that the examiner's analysis of Kotaki et al. does not even recite that Kotaki et al. satisfies the limitation that "the protrusion engages the printhead interior surface and no part of the protrusion, base, or lid engages the camming shoe." Applicant respectfully contends that the examiner must have simply overlooked this limitation, because there is no way to construe Kotaki et al. as satisfying it.

Objections

The objections to the informalities in claims 3 and 5 are addressed in the above amendment to the claims. The objection to the drawings should be withdrawn because there should not be "primes"—that is just a copying artifact.

It is submitted that the presently pending claims are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art, and a Notice of Allowability is believed proper.

If examiner does not believe that the claims are in condition for allowance after review of this response, the examiner is requested to grant a telephone interview. An interview, if necessary, could be helpful because the present invention is very different from Kotaki et al. and the other art previously cited by the examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

  
Peter F. Weinberg, #40,866  
1801 California Street, Suite 4100  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: 303-298-5901

cc. Charles Duke

60097750\_1.DOC